

REMARKS

Claims 1 to 35 are pending in the application; claims 30-35 are withdrawn.

Election/Restriction

Applicant herewith affirms election of claims 1-29 for prosecution.

Specification

The Abstract of the Disclosure has been shortened and now contains fewer than 150 words.

The wording in regard to the description of Fig. 5 in the section BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE DRAWINGS has been corrected.

Claim Objections

Claim 26 has been corrected according to examiner's suggestion.

In claim 27, the wording "of the vehicle" has been deleted.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102

Claim 27 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by *Shanley* (US 1,274,340).

The prior art reference discloses a signal light for a vehicle that is comprised of a casing 1 with openings 4 and 5 behind which light sources are arranged. The openings 4 are covered by a transparent colored glass with white letters thereon. The casing 1 is to be mounted by means of bracket 11 on the vehicle. The bracket 11 is arranged behind the bottom plate 7. The side wings 8 (see Fig. 2) are provided for attaching the license plate of the vehicle that can be illuminated by means of the slot 2 at the bottom edge of the casing (Fig. 1).

Clearly, the signal device is to be mounted on the exterior of the vehicle as an attachment and not on the inner side of a continuous carbody part of the vehicle. Moreover, a carbody having perforations filled with light-transmissive material in an area behind which the vehicle light housing is arranged is not disclosed. The casing 1 of the signal of the cited reference is a self-contained device to be attached to the exterior of the vehicle or of the carbody as is apparent from its configuration including fastening bracket 11, slots in the wings 8 for attaching the license plate; and the illumination slot 2 for the

license plate.

Also the "perforation openings" 4 are not filled in with light-transmissive material - a glass plate is mounted inside the casing to close off the opening. As can be seen in Fig. 1 of *Shanley*, the openings 4 covered by the glass plates 6 create recesses; there is no flush surface as it would be in the case of filled-in light-transmissive material.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the claim 27 pursuant to 35 USC 102 are therefore respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 28 and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Shanley* (US 1,274,340) and *Foti* (US 2,963,613).

According to the present invention, the vehicle light is arranged such that the exterior side of the lens or of the filled-in light-transmissive material in the perforation is flush with the outer side of the carbody part or of the mirror housing. The vehicle light is to be invisible from the exterior and this is achieved in that a coating, advantageously a coat of paint matching the vehicle paint is applied which is only so thick that the perforation openings cannot be detected from the exterior but allow the passage of light.

The secondary reference to *Foti* shows a partial coating 20 covering a headlight lens 18 for reducing glare and for preventing oncoming traffic from being blinded. The color range given is yellow through red. The entire lens 1 cannot be covered because that would destroy the function of the device as a head light.

The prior art *Foti* cannot suggest that perforations in a carbody filled in with light-transmissive material are coated with a coating that is only so thick that the perforation openings cannot be detected from the exterior but allow the passage of light (see paragraph 0036 of the instant specification). Moreover, *Foti* cannot suggest that the color of the coating is identical to the color of the carbody part.

There is no suggestion provided to correlate the color of the partial coating 20 with that of the carbody. Obviously, the color choice provided in *Foti* relates to the desired glare reduction effect.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the claims 28 and 29 pursuant to 35 USC 103 are therefore respectfully requested.

- 11 -

9/26/05: Amd for Ser. No. 10/605,986 - Inventor(s): Zimmermann et al. - Filing Date: 11/12/2003

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Claims 1 to 25 are allowed.

Claim 26 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections set forth in the office action. The claim language of claim 26 has been corrected as suggested and should thus be allowable.


CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that this application is now in condition for allowance and such allowance is respectfully solicited.

Should the Examiner have any further objections or suggestions, the undersigned would appreciate a phone call or e-mail from the examiner to discuss appropriate amendments to place the application into condition for allowance.

Authorization is herewith given to charge any fees or any shortages in any fees required during prosecution of this application and not paid by other means to Patent and Trademark Office deposit account 50-1199.

Respectfully submitted on September 26, 2005.


Ms. Gudrun E. Hockett, Ph.D.
Patent Agent, Registration No. 35,747
Lönsstr. 53
42289 Wuppertal
GERMANY
Telephone: +49-202-257-0371
Facsimile: +49-202-257-0372
gudrun.draudt@t-online.de

GEH

Encl.: time extension petition (1 sheet)